arXiv:1410.2371v1 [cs.CC] 9 Oct 2014

Satisfying ternary permutation constraints by multiple linear orders or phylogenetic trees

Leo van Iersel, Steven Kelk, Nela Lekić, Simone Linz

October 10, 2014

Abstract

A ternary permutation constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) is specified by a subset Π of the symmetric group S_3. An instance of such a problem consists of a set of variables V and a set of constraints $\mathcal{C}$, where each constraint is an ordered triple of distinct elements from V. The goal is to construct a linear order α on V such that, for each constraint $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{C}$, the ordering of a, b, c induced by α is in Π. Excluding symmetries and trivial cases there are 11 such problems, and their complexity is well known. Here we consider the variant of the problem, denoted 2-Π, where we are allowed to construct two linear orders α and β and each constraint needs to be satisfied by at least one of the two. We give a full complexity classification of all 11 2-Π problems, observing that in the switch from one to two linear orders the complexity landscape changes quite abruptly and that hardness proofs become rather intricate. We then focus on one of the 11 problems in particular, which is closely related to the 2-Caterpillar Compatibility problem in the phylogenetics literature. We show that this particular CSP remains hard on three linear orders, and also in the biologically relevant case when we swap three linear orders for three phylogenetic trees, yielding the 3-Tree Compatibility problem. Due to the biological relevance of this problem we also give extremal results concerning the minimum number of trees required, in the worst case, to satisfy a set of rooted triplet constraints on n leaf labels.

1 Introduction

A *ternary permutation* constraint satisfaction problem (CSP), sometimes also known as an *ordering* CSP, is specified by a subset Π of the symmetric group S_3. An instance of such a problem consists of a set of variables V and a set of constraints $\mathcal{C}$, where each constraint is an ordered triple of distinct elements from V. The goal is to construct a linear order α on V such that, for each constraint $(a, b, c) \in \mathcal{C}$, the ordering of a, b, c induced by α is in Π. For example, if $\Pi = \{123, 132\}$ then for each constraint (a, b, c) we require that $\alpha(a) < \alpha(b) < \alpha(c)$ or $\alpha(a) < \alpha(c) < \alpha(b)$, which can be summarized as $\alpha(a) < \min(\alpha(b), \alpha(c))$. Excluding symmetries and trivial cases there are 11 such problems, some of which have acquired specific names in the literature, such as *betweenness* [5] and *cyclic ordering* [6]. A full complexity classification of the 11 problems is given in [10] and summarized in Table 1. Due to their fundamental character these problems have stimulated quite some interest from the approximation [8], parameterized complexity [9] and algebra [2] communities.

In this article we consider the variant of the problem, denoted k-Π, where we are allowed to construct k linear orders and each constraint needs to be satisfied by at least one of them. We give a full complexity classification of all 11 2-Π problems, observing that in the switch from one to two linear orders the complexity landscape does not behave monotonically (see Table

1). We note that for a single linear order the polynomial-time variants can be solved with variations of topological sorting, and the hard variants can be proven NP-complete using fairly straightforward reductions [10]. In the case of two linear orders all the polynomial-time variants are *trivially* solveable while, for the other variants, establishing the NP-completeness is much more challenging, requiring a wide array of novel gadgets and constructions.

Following this classification, we shift our focus to *phylogenetics*, a branch of computational biology concerned with the inferrence of evolutionary histories [18]. Here we are given a set of *rooted triplets* which are leaf labeled, rooted binary trees on three leaves. Rooted triplets have a central and recurring role within phylogenetics due to the fact that they can be viewed as the atomic building blocks of larger evolutionary histories [18]. The goal in the k-Tree Compatibility problem, introduced in [12] is to partition the set of triplets into at most k blocks such that the triplets inside each block can be topologically embedded into a tree-like hypothesis of evolution known as a phylogenetic tree. This problem is particularly topical given the growing awareness that a genome often contains multiple tree-like evolutionary signals that need to be untangled [11, 14, 15]. Determining whether a single block (i.e. a single tree) is sufficient can be computed in polynomial-time, using the classical algorithm of Aho [1]. More recently, Linz et al. [12] determined that it is NP-complete to determine whether two trees are sufficient. We observe that the problem 2-Π_1 (which corresponds to the $\Pi = \{123, 132\}$ example given earlier) is equivalent to the problem Linz et al. studied, with one extra restriction: the two phylogenetic trees we construct must be "caterpillars", yielding the 2-Caterpillar Compatibility problem. Our hardness result for 2-Π_1 thus supplements the hardness result of Linz et al. (and, as a spin-off result, establishes a link to the literature on the dichromatic number problem [3]). To further extend this result we show that 3-Π_1 is hard and, building on this machinery, 3-Tree Compatibility is also hard. As with many of the hardness results in this article we make heavy use of special gadgets that are unique solutions to the set of constraints that they imply. Such uniqueness gadgets are likely to be of independent interest in their own right.

We then explore k-Tree Compatibility from an extremal perspective. In particular, how many blocks (i.e. phylogenetic trees) are required, in the worst case, to satisfy a set of triplets on n leaf labels? Empirical experiments show that this function $\tau(n)$ grows so slowly that the question arises: does there exist a constant c such that c trees are always sufficient? We prove that the answer is *no*, showing that $\tau(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. This shows that the k-Tree Compatibility problem does not become trivial for any $k > 1$, which supports the conjecture of Linz et al. that the problem is NP-complete for every $k > 1$. We also show a logarithmic upper bound.

We conclude with some open problems and future directions for research.

2 Preliminaries

This section provides notation and terminology that is used in the remainder of the paper. Preliminaries in the context of phylogenetics are given in the second part of this section.

2.1 Ternary permutation constraint satisfaction problems

In this paper, we investigate eleven ternary permutation constraint satisfaction problems that are all based on subsets of the symmetric group on three elements, i.e.

$$S_3 = \{123, 132, 213, 231, 312, 321\}.$$

An instance $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C})$ of such a problem consists of a set V of *variables* and a set $\mathcal{C}$ of *constraints*, where each constraint is an ordered triple (v_1, v_2, v_3) of three distinct variables of V.

		1LO	2LO
Π_0 (linear ordering)	123	P	NPC
Π_1	123, 132	P	NPC
Π_2	123, 213, 231	P	P
Π_3	123, 231, 312, 321	P	P
Π_4	123, 231	NPC	NPC
Π_5 (betweenness)	123, 321	NPC	NPC
Π_6	123, 132, 231	NPC	NPC
Π_7 (circular ordering)	123, 231, 312	NPC	P
Π_8	$S_3 \setminus$ 123, 231	NPC	P
Π_9 (non-betweenness)	$S_3 \setminus$ 123, 321	NPC	NPC
Π_{10}	$S_3 \setminus$ 123	NPC	P

Table 1: The complexity of the 11 ternary permutations CSPs, in the case of 1 linear order (1LO) (see [10]) and 2 linear orders (2LO) (this article).

Let $\alpha : V \to \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ be a linear ordering of V, where $|V| = m$. We sometimes write

$$(\alpha^{-1}(1), \alpha^{-1}(2), \ldots, \alpha^{-1}(m))$$

to denote α.

Let V and V' be two sets of variables such that $V \cap V' = \emptyset$. Furthermore, let α be a linear ordering of V, and let β be a linear ordering of V'. We use $\bar{\alpha}$ to denote the ordering obtained from α by inverting it and call $\bar{\alpha}$ the *reversal* of α. Furthermore, for a subset S of V, the *restriction of α to S* is the linear ordering, say γ, on S with the property that $\gamma(v_j) < \gamma(v_{j'})$ if and only if $\alpha(v_j) < \alpha(v_{j'})$ for each pair of elements $v_j, v_{j'} \in S$. We denote γ by $\alpha - (V - S)$. Now, let γ be a linear ordering of $V \cup V'$ such that $\gamma(v_j) < \gamma(v_{j'})$ if and only if $\alpha(v_j) < \alpha(v_{j'})$ for each pair of elements $v_j, v_{j'} \in V$. Then γ is said to *preserve* α. Let γ be a linear ordering of $V \cup V'$ that preserves α and β and has the property that $\gamma(v_j) < \gamma(v_{j'})$ for each $v_j \in V$ and $v_{j'} \in V'$. We use $\alpha||\beta$ to denote γ. Intuitively, γ is the concatenation of α followed by β.

Referring back to Table 1, let Π_i be a subset of S_3 for some $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 10\}$, and let $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of a ternary permutation constraint satisfaction problem. Furthermore, let α be a linear ordering of V. We say that a constraint (v_1, v_2, v_3) in $\mathcal{C}$ is *Π_i-satisfied* by α, if there is a permutation $\pi \in \Pi$ such that $\alpha(v_{\pi(1)}) < \alpha(v_{\pi(2)}) < \alpha(v_{\pi(3)})$ where here π is assumed to map positions to symbols. For example, if (v_1, v_2, v_3) is Π_5-satisfied by α, then either $\alpha(v_1) < \alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_3)$ or $\alpha(v_3) < \alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_1)$.

For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 10\}$, we are now in a position to define the following decision problem.

k-Π_i
Instance. A finite set V of variables and a set $\mathcal{C}$ of ordered triples of distinct variables from V and a positive integer k.
Question. Do there exist at most k linear orderings of V such that each constraint (v_1, v_2, v_3) in $\mathcal{C}$ is Π_i-satisfied by one of these orderings.

If the answer to an instance $\mathcal{I}$ of k-Π_i is 'yes', we say that $\mathcal{I}$ is *k-Π_i-satisfiable* (or *Π_i-satisfiable* for short if $k = 1$).

Lastly, let α be a linear ordering of a set V of variables. We say that α *implies a constraint*

(v_1, v_2, v_3) *under* Π_i precisely if (v_1, v_2, v_3) is Π_i-satisfied by α. Furthermore, we use $\mathcal{C}_{\Pi_i}(\alpha)$ to denote the set of all constraints that are implied by α under Π_i.

2.2 Phylogenetics background

This section contains preliminaries in the context of phylogenetics. For a more thorough overview, we refer the interested reader to [18].

A *binary unrooted phylogenetic tree* of order n is a tree in which all internal vertices have degree 3 and which has n leaves that are bijectively labeled with elements in $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. For two binary unrooted phylogenetic trees T and T', we say that T *displays* T' if T' can be obtained from a subtree of T by suppressing degree-2 vertices.

A *binary rooted phylogenetic tree* of order n is a rooted tree in which all edges are directed away from the root which has outdegree 2, all internal vertices have indegree 1 and outdegree 2, and which has n leaves that are bijectively labeled with elements in $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. If two leaves a and b of a rooted phylogenetic tree T are adjacent to the same parent, then $\{a, b\}$ is called a *cherry* of T. Furthermore, a binary rooted phylogenetic tree that has exactly one cherry is called a *caterpillar*. For two vertices u and v of a binary rooted phylogenetic tree T, we write $u <_T v$ to denote that there exists a directed path from u to v in T. Moreover, $\mathrm{lca}_T(u, v)$ denotes the lowest common ancestor of u and v in T, i.e. $\mathrm{lca}_T(u, v)$ is the unique vertex w such that $w <_T u$, $w <_T v$ and there is no vertex $w' \neq w$ such that $w' <_T v$, $w' <_T v$ and $w <_T w'$. Again, let T be a rooted phylogenetic tree whose leaves are bijectively labeled with elements in X, and let Y be a subset of X. We call X the *leaf set* of T and denote it by $L(T)$. Furthermore, the *minimal rooted subtree* of T that connects all the leaves in Y is denoted by $T(Y)$. Lastly, the *restriction of* T *to* Y, denoted by $T|Y$, is the rooted phylogenetic tree obtained from $T(Y)$ by contracting all degree-two vertices apart from the root.

Next, we introduce a special type of binary rooted phylogenetic tree. A *(rooted) triplet* is a binary rooted phylogenetic tree on three leaves (see Figure 1). We say that a binary rooted phylogenetic tree T *displays* a triplet $ab|c$ (or, equivalently, $ba|c$) if $\mathrm{lca}_T(a, c) = \mathrm{lca}_T(b, c) <_T \mathrm{lca}_T(a, b)$. Moreover, for a triplet $ab|c$, we call c the *witness* of $ab|c$. Now, let $\mathcal{R}$ be a set of triplets. If there exists a rooted phylogenetic tree T such that each triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by T, we say that $\mathcal{R}$ is *compatible* and, otherwise, we say that $\mathcal{R}$ is *incompatible.*



Figure 1: A rooted triplet $01|2$.

We are now in a position to state a decision problem that plays an important role in this paper and is strongly related to k-Π_1.

k-Caterpillar Compatibility
Instance. A set $\mathcal{R}$ of rooted triplets.
Question. Do there exist at most k caterpillars such that each element in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by at least one such caterpillar?

2.3 A note on k-Π_1 and k-Caterpillar Compatibility

A rooted triplet $ab|c$ is a rooted binary phylogenetic tree on three leaves. It is important to note that a and b are indistinguishable from a phylogenetics point of view because a rooted binary phylogenetic tree T on three leaves a, b, and c and with $\{a, b\}$ being the cherry of T such that a is the right and b is the left child of the common parent of a and b is considered to be the same as the tree obtained from T by swapping a and b.

Let $(1, 2, \ldots, n-1, n)$ denote a caterpillar T on n leaves whose cherry is $\{n-1, n\}$ and the path from each leaf labeled $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$ to the root of T has length i while the path from the leaf labeled n to the root of T to has length $n-1$. Since n and $n-1$ are indistinguishable, T naturally corresponds to the two linear ordering $(n, n-1, n-2, \ldots, 2, 1)$ and $(n-1, n, n-2, \ldots, 2, 1)$. Moreover, each constraint (a, b, c) in an instance of k-Π_1 can be satisfied by an ordering α with $\alpha(a) < \alpha(b) < \alpha(c)$ or $\alpha(a) < \alpha(c) < \alpha(b)$ and corresponds to a rooted triplet $bc|a$ that can be displayed by a caterpillar whose distance from a to the root is shorter than the distance from b to the root and also shorter than the distance from c to the root. We summarize the strong relationship between the two problems in the following observation.

Observation 1. *The problem k-Π_1 is NP-complete if and only if k-Caterpillar Compatibility is NP-complete.*

3 Hardness results for all eleven CSP problems on two linear orderings

In this section, we settle the complexity of each ternary permutation CSP problem 2-Π_i with $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 10\}$. We start with the following observation.

Observation 2. *For each $i \in \{2, 3, 7, 8, 10\}$, the problem 2-Π_i is trivially polynomial-time solveable. In particular, every instance is a 'yes'-instance.*

Proof. It can easily be verified that, for each of the described problems, $\{\alpha, \bar{\alpha}\}$ is a valid solution, for *any* linear ordering α. □

The next observation is easily verified and implicitly used throughout the remainder of this section.

Observation 3. *For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, 10\}$, the problem 2-$\Pi_i$ is in NP.*

Theorem 1. *The problem 2-Π_0 is NP-complete.*

Proof. To establish the result, we use a polynomial-time reduction from 1-Π_5. Let $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of 1-Π_5. Let $\mathcal{C}'$ be the set of ternary constraints in which each constraint in $\mathcal{C}$ is represented by two constraints. In particular, set

$$\mathcal{C}' = \bigcup_{(v_1, v_2, v_3) \in \mathcal{C}} \{(v_1, v_2, v_3), (v_3, v_2, v_1)\}.$$

Now, let $\mathcal{I}' = (V, \mathcal{C}')$ be an instance of 2-Π_0. As $|\mathcal{C}'| = 2|\mathcal{C}|$, we have that $\mathcal{I}'$ has polynomial size and that the reduction can be carried out in polynomial time. We now claim that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable if and only if $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_0-satisfiable.

Suppose that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable. Let α be a linear ordering of V that satisfies $\mathcal{I}$. It is now easily checked that, for each constraint (v_1, v_2, v_3) in $\mathcal{C}$, either $\alpha(v_1) < \alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_3)$ in which

case $\bar{\alpha}(v_3) < \bar{\alpha}(v_2) < \bar{\alpha}(v_1)$ or $\alpha(v_3) < \alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_1)$ in which case $\bar{\alpha}(v_1) < \bar{\alpha}(v_2) < \bar{\alpha}(v_3)$. Hence, α and $\bar{\alpha}$ are a solution to $\mathcal{I}'$ and, so, $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_0-satisfiable.

On the other hand, suppose that $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_0-satisfiable. Let α and β be two linear orderings of V that satisfy $\mathcal{I}'$, and let (v_1, v_2, v_3) be an element of $\mathcal{C}$. Then exactly one element in $\{(v_1, v_2, v_3), (v_3, v_2, v_1)\}$ is Π_0-satisfied by α. Hence, $\alpha(v_1) < \alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_3)$ or $\alpha(v_3) < \alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_1)$. Both cases imply that (v_1, v_2, v_3) is Π_5-satisfied by α. Hence, α is a solution to $\mathcal{I}$ and, so $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable. The theorem now follows. □

Theorem 2. *The problem* 2-Π_1 *is NP-complete.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of 2-Π_0, where $\mathcal{C} = \{C^1, C^2, \ldots, C^n\}$. Furthermore, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, let $C^i = (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i)$, with $\{v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i\} \subseteq V$, and let v_d^i and v_e^i be two new variables, not contained in V, corresponding to each constraint. To show that the theorem holds, we reduce $\mathcal{I}$ to an instance of 2-Π_1. Set

$$V' = V \cup \{v_d^1, v_e^1, v_d^2, v_e^2, \ldots, v_d^n, v_e^n\},$$

and set

$$\mathcal{C}' = \bigcup_{C^i \in \mathcal{C}} \{(v_1^i, v_2^i, v_d^i), (v_2^i, v_3^i, v_e^i), (v_e^i, v_1^i, v_2^i), (v_d^i, v_1^i, v_2^i), (v_1^i, v_e^i, v_d^i)\}.$$

Now, let $\mathcal{I}' = (V', \mathcal{C}')$ be an instance of 2-Π_1. Since $|V'| = |V| + 2n$ and $|\mathcal{C}'| = 5|\mathcal{C}|$, the reduction can clearly be carried out in polynomial time and has polynomial size. The remainder of the proof consists of establishing that $\mathcal{I}$ is 2-Π_0-satisfiable if and only if $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_1-satisfiable.

First, suppose that $\mathcal{I}$ is 2-Π_0-satisfiable. Let α and β be two linear orderings of V that satisfy $\mathcal{I}$. Let

$$W = \{v_d^i, v_e^i : C^i \text{ is } \Pi_0\text{-satisfied by } \alpha\}$$

and, similarly, let

$$W' = \{v_d^i, v_e^i : C^i \text{ is not } \Pi_0\text{-satisfied by } \alpha\}.$$

Furthermore, let γ be an arbitrary linear ordering of W, and let γ' be an arbitrary linear ordering of W'. Then $\alpha' = \gamma' || \alpha || \gamma$ and $\beta' = \gamma || \beta || \gamma'$ are two linear orderings on V'. Now, for each $C^i = (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i)$ that is Π_0-satisfied by α (resp. β), the three constraints (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_d^i), (v_2^i, v_3^i, v_e^i), and (v_1^i, v_e^i, v_d^i) are Π_1-satisfied by α' (resp β') while the two constraints (v_e^i, v_1^i, v_2^i) and (v_d^i, v_1^i, v_2^i) are Π_1-satisfied by β' (resp. α'). Hence $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_1-satisfiable.

Second, suppose that $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_1-satisfiable. Let α' and β' be two linear orderings of V' that satisfy $\mathcal{I}'$. Assume that, for some $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, the two constraints (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_d^i) and (v_2^i, v_3^i, v_e^i) are not both Π_1-satisfied by exactly one of α' and β'. Then without loss of generality, we may assume that (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_d^i) is Π_1-satisfied by α' and that (v_2^i, v_3^i, v_e^i) is Π_1-satisfied by β'. Since $\beta'(v_2^i) < \beta'(v_e^i)$, it follows that (v_e^i, v_1, v_2^i) is Π_1-satisfied by α'. Similarly, since $\alpha'(v_1^i) < \alpha'(v_d^i)$, it follows that (v_d^i, v_1^i, v_2^i) is Π_1-satisfied by β'. Moreover, since $\alpha'(v_e^i) < \alpha'(v_1^i)$ and $\beta'(v_d^i) < \beta'(v_1^i)$, this implies that neither α' nor by β Π_1-satisfies (v_1^i, v_e^i, v_d^i). Thus, (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_d^i) and (v_2^i, v_3^i, v_e^i) are both Π_1-satisfied by either α' or β'. Hence, we have $\alpha'(v_1^i) < \alpha'(v_2^i) < \alpha'(v_3^i)$ or $\beta'(v_1^i) < \beta'(v_2^i) < \beta'(v_3^i)$. It now follows that $\mathcal{I}$ is 2-Π_0-satisfied by the two linear orderings α' restricted to V and β' restricted to V. The theorem now follows. □

Theorem 3. *The problem* 2-Π_4 *is NP-complete.*

Proof. To establish the result, we use a polynomial-time reduction from 1-Π_9. Let $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of 1-Π_9. Let $\mathcal{C}'$ be the set of ternary constraints in which each constraint in $\mathcal{C}$ is represented by two constraints. In particular, set

$$\mathcal{C}' = \bigcup_{(v_1, v_2, v_3) \in \mathcal{C}} \{(v_2, v_1, v_3), (v_2, v_3, v_1)\}.$$

Now, let $\mathcal{I}' = (V, \mathcal{C}')$ be an instance of 2-Π_4. As $|\mathcal{C}'| = 2|\mathcal{C}|$, we have that $\mathcal{I}'$ has polynomial size and that the reduction can be carried out in polynomial time. We now claim that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_9-satisfiable if and only if $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_4-satisfiable.

Suppose that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_9-satisfiable. Let α be a linear ordering of V that satisfies $\mathcal{I}$. It follows that, for each constraint (v_1, v_2, v_3) in $\mathcal{C}$, either $\alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_i) < \alpha(v_j)$, or $\alpha(v_{i'}) < \alpha(v_{j'}) < \alpha(v_2)$ with $\{i, j\} = \{i', j'\} = \{1, 3\}$. Moreover, in both cases, it is easily checked that exactly one of (v_2, v_1, v_3) and (v_2, v_3, v_1) is Π_4-satisfied by α while the other constraint is Π_4-satisfied by $\bar{\alpha}$. Hence, α and $\bar{\alpha}$ are a solution to $\mathcal{I}'$ and, so, $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_4-satisfiable.

Now, suppose that $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_4-satisfiable. Let α and β be two linear orderings of V that satisfy $\mathcal{I}'$, and let (v_1, v_2, v_3) be an element of $\mathcal{C}$. Then exactly one element in $\{(v_2, v_1, v_3), (v_2, v_3, v_1)\}$ is Π_4-satisfied by α. In particular, this implies that exactly one of the following holds:

(i) $\alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_1) < \alpha(v_3)$,

(ii) $\alpha(v_1) < \alpha(v_3) < \alpha(v_2)$,

(iii) $\alpha(v_2) < \alpha(v_3) < \alpha(v_1)$, or

(iv) $\alpha(v_3) < \alpha(v_1) < \alpha(v_2)$.

Regardless of which of (i)-(iv) holds, (v_1, v_2, v_3) is Π_9-satisfied by α. Hence, α is a solution to $\mathcal{I}$. The theorem now follows. □

Lemma 1. *Let $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, and let $\gamma = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ and $\gamma' = (5, 2, 3, 4, 1)$ be two linear orderings of V. Then the instance $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_5}(\gamma) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_5}(\gamma'))$ of 2-Π_5 has a unique solution (up to reversal). In particular, each solution of $\mathcal{I}$ consists of one element from $\{\gamma, \bar{\gamma}\}$ and one element from $\{\gamma', \bar{\gamma}'\}$.*

Proof. Computational proof (see appendix). □

Theorem 4. *The problem 2-Π_5 is NP-complete.*

Proof. Throughout the proof, let $\gamma = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ and $\gamma' = (5, 2, 3, 4, 1)$ be two linear orderings of $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Let $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of 1-Π_5, where $\mathcal{C} = \{C^1, C^2, \ldots, C^n\}$. Furthermore, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, let $C^i = (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i)$, with $\{v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i\} \subseteq V$, and let v_d^i and v_e^i be two new variables, not contained in V, for each constraint. To show that the theorem holds, we reduce $\mathcal{I}$ to an instance of 2-Π_5. Let $D = \{v_d^1, v_e^1, v_d^2, v_e^2, \ldots, v_d^n, v_e^n\}$, and let

$$V' = V \cup D \cup \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\},$$

where $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ neither intersects with D nor V. Furthermore, we define the following four new sets of constraints.

(i) Let $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_5}(\gamma) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_5}(\gamma')$.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{C}_2 = \bigcup_{C^i \in \mathcal{C}} \{(v_1^i, v_d^i, v_3^i), (v_1^i, v_e^i, v_3^i), (v_d^i, v_2^i, v_e^i)\}$.

(iii) Let $\mathcal{C}_3 = \bigcup_{v_j \in V} \{(3, v_j, 4), (4, v_j, 5), (1, v_j, 2), (1, v_j, 3)\}$.

(iv) Let $\mathcal{C}_4 = \bigcup_{i \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}} \{(2, v_d^i, 3), (2, v_e^i, 3), (1, v_d^i, 2), (1, v_e^i, 2), (4, v_d^i, 5), (4, v_e^i, 5), (3, v_d^i, 5), (3, v_e^i, 5)\}$.

Now, let $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2 \cup \mathcal{C}_3 \cup \mathcal{C}_4$, and let $\mathcal{I}' = (V', \mathcal{C}')$ be an instance of 2-Π_5. Since $\mathcal{C}_1$ contains a constant number of constraints it is easily checked that $\mathcal{I}'$ has size polynomial in $|V|$ and n and, so, the reduction can be carried out in polynomial time. We now claim that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable if and only if $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_5-satisfiable.

First, suppose that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable. Let α be a linear ordering of V that satisfies $\mathcal{I}$. Let δ be a linear ordering of $V \cup D$ such that

$$\delta(v_1^i) < \delta(v_d^i) < \delta(v_2^i) < \delta(v_e^i) < \delta(v_3^i) \text{ or } \delta(v_3^i) < \delta(v_e^i) < \delta(v_2^i) < \delta(v_d^i) < \delta(v_1^i)$$

for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Since α is a solution to $\mathcal{I}$, note that δ exists.

Now, let

$$\alpha' = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)||\delta,$$

and let

$$\beta' = (5, 2)||\delta - V||(3)||\alpha||(4, 1)$$

be two linear orderings of V'. We next argue that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}'$ is Π_5-satisfied by α' or β'. Since α' preserves γ and since β' preserves γ', it follows that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}_1$ is Π_5-satisfied by α' or β'. Furthermore, for each $C^i \in \mathcal{C}$, the three corresponding constraints in $\mathcal{C}_2$ are, by construction, Π_5-satisfied by α'. Turning to the constraints in $\mathcal{C}_3$, we observe that $\max(\beta'(2), \beta'(3), \beta'(5)) < \beta'(v_j)$ and $\beta'(v_j) < \min(\beta'(1), \beta'(4))$ and, hence, all four constraints that correspond to v_j in $\mathcal{C}_3$ are Π_5-satisfied by β'. Similarly, for $k \in \{d, e\}$, a straightforward check shows that all eight constraints that correspond to v_k^i in $\mathcal{C}_4$ are Π_5-satisfied by β'. Now, as each constraint in $\mathcal{C}'$ is Π_5-satisfied by α' or β', we deduce that $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_5-satisfiable.

Second, suppose that $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_5-satisfiable. Let α' and β' be two linear orderings of V' that satisfy $\mathcal{I}'$. Note that, by Lemma 1, each solution to the instance $(\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}, \mathcal{C}_1)$ of 2-Π_5 consists of one element from $\{\gamma, \bar{\gamma}\}$ and one element from $\{\gamma', \bar{\gamma}'\}$. Assume for the time being that α' preserves γ and that β' preserves γ'. Now assume that $(3, v_j, 4)$ is Π_5-satisfied by α' for some $v_j \in V$. Then each constraint in $\{(4, v_j, 5), (1, v_j, 2), (1, v_j, 3)\}$ and, hence, $(3, v_j, 4)$ is Π_5-satisfied by β'. On the other hand, assume that $(3, v_j, 4)$ is not Π_5-satisfied by α' for some $v_j \in V$. Then, $(3, v_j, 4)$ is Π_5-satisfied by β'. Thus, regardless of whether $(3, v_j, 4)$ is Π_5-satisfied by α' or not, we have $\beta'(3) < \beta'(v_j) < \beta'(4)$. Similarly, assume that $(2, v_k^i, 3)$ is Π_5-satisfied by α' for some $k \in \{d, e\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. Then each constraint in $\{(1, v_k^i, 2), (4, v_k^i, 5), (3, v_k^i, 5)\}$ and, hence, $(2, v_k^i, 3)$ is Π_5-satisfied by β'. On the other hand, assume that $(2, v_k^i, 3)$ is not Π_5-satisfied by α' for some $v_k^i \in V$. Then, $(2, v_k^i, 3)$ is Π_5-satisfied by β'. Thus, regardless of whether $(2, v_k^i, 3)$ is Π_5-satisfied by α' or not, we have $\beta'(2) < \beta'(v_k^i) < \beta'(3)$. In summary, it follows that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}_3 \cup \mathcal{C}_4$ is Π_5-satisfied by β'. Now, since $\beta'(v_k^i) < \beta'(3) < \beta'(v_j)$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, $k \in \{d, e\}$, and $v_j \in V$, it follows that, for each $C^i \in \mathcal{C}$, the three constraints in $\{(v_1^i, v_d^i, v_3^i), (v_1^i, v_e^i, v_3^i), (v_d^i, v_2^i, v_e^i)\}$ are Π_5-satisfied by α'. It is now straightforward to check that $\alpha'(v_1^i) < \alpha'(v_2^i) < \alpha'(v_3^i)$ or $\alpha'(v_3^i) < \alpha'(v_2^i) < \alpha'(v_1^i)$. Hence, $\alpha' - (\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \cup D)$ is a linear ordering of V that 1-Π_5-satisfies each constraint in $\mathcal{C}$ and, therefore, we have that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable. We complete the proof of the converse by noting that symmetrical arguments can be used to show that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable if α' preserves $\bar{\gamma}$ (rather than γ) and/or β' preserves $\bar{\gamma}'$ (rather than γ'.) The theorem now follows by combining both cases. □

Lemma 2. *Let $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and let $\gamma = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $\gamma' = (2, 4, 1, 3)$ be two linear orderings of V. Then the instance $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_6}(\gamma) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_6}(\gamma'))$ of 2-Π_6 has a unique solution. In particular, γ and γ' are a solution of $\mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. Computational proof (see appendix). □

Theorem 5. *The problem 2-Π_6 is NP-complete.*

Proof. Throughout the proof, let $\gamma = (1, 2, 3, 4)$ and $\gamma' = (2, 4, 1, 3)$ be two linear orderings of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Let $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of 2-Π_1 with $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_m\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{C^1, C^2, \ldots, C^n\}$. Furthermore, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, let $C^i = (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i)$, with $\{v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i\} \subseteq V$. Lastly, let $D = \{1_{v_1}, 1_{v_2}, \ldots, 1_{v_m}\}$ such that $D \cap \{1, 2, 3, 4\} = \emptyset$. To show that the result holds, we reduce $\mathcal{I}$ to an instance $\mathcal{I}'$ of 2-Π_6 in the following way. For each $v_j \in V$, we use $\mathcal{C}(v_j)$ to denote the set obtained from $\mathcal{C}_{\Pi_6}(\gamma) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_6}(\gamma')$ by replacing each occurrence of the variable 1 with 1_{v_j}. Let $V' = D \cup \{2, 3, 4\}$ be a set of variables. We next define two new sets of constraints. In particular, let

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \bigcup_{v_j \in V} \mathcal{C}(v_j),$$

and let

$$\mathcal{C}_2 = \bigcup_{C^i \in \mathcal{C}} \{(1_{v_1^i}, 1_{v_2^i}, 1_{v_3^i}), (1_{v_1^i}, 1_{v_3^i}, 1_{v_2^i}), (1_{v_1^i}, 1_{v_2^i}, 3)\},$$

where each of $1_{v_1^i}$, $1_{v_2^i}$, and $1_{v_3^i}$ is an element in D.

Now, let $\mathcal{I}' = (V', \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2)$ and observe that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$ consists indeed of three elements in V'. Moreover, since $\mathcal{C}_1$ contains a number of constraints that is polynomial in m, it is easily checked that $\mathcal{I}'$ has size polynomial in m and n and, so, the reduction can be carried out in polynomial time. To complete the proof, we show that $\mathcal{I}$ is 2-Π_1-satisfiable if and only if $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_6-satisfiable.

First, suppose that $\mathcal{I}$ is 2-Π_1-satisfiable. Then there exist two linear orderings α and β on V such that each $C^j \in \mathcal{C}$ is Π_1-satisfied by α or β. Let α_1 be the linear ordering of D obtained from α by replacing each v_j with 1_{v_j} and, similarly, let β_1 be the linear ordering of D obtained from β by replacing each v_j with 1_{v_j}. Now, let

$$\alpha' = \alpha_1 || (2, 3, 4),$$

and let

$$\beta' = (2, 4) || \beta_1 || (3)$$

be two linear orderings on V'. We next show that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$ is Π_6-satisfied by α' or β'. Since no constraint in $\mathcal{C}_1$ contains two elements of D, it follows by Lemma 2 and regarding 1 as a placeholder for α_1 (resp. β_1), that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}_1$ is Π_6-satisfied by α' or β'. Turning to the constraints in $\mathcal{C}_2$, we have that, if $C^i \in \mathcal{C}$ is Π_1-satisfied by α, then the first two constraints that correspond to C^i in $\mathcal{C}_2$ are Π_6-satisfied by α' while, if C^i is Π_1-satisfied by β, then the first two constraints that correspond to C^i in $\mathcal{C}_2$ are Π_6-satisfied by β'. Moreover, since $\max(\alpha'(1_{v_1^i}), \alpha'(1_{v_2^i})) < \alpha'(3)$ and $\max(\beta'(1_{v_1^i}), \beta'(1_{v_2^i})) < \beta'(3)$, it follows that $(1_{v_1^i}, 1_{v_2^i}, 3)$ is Π_6-satisfied by α' or β'. Now, as each constraint in $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$ is Π_6-satisfied by α' or β', we deduce that $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_6-satisfiable.

Second, suppose that $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_6-satisfiable. Then, there exist two linear orderings α' and β' on V' such that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$ is Π_6-satisfied by α' or β'. We next show that, for each $1_{v_j} \in D$ with $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, we have $\alpha'(1_{v_j}) < \alpha'(2)$ and $\beta'(4) < \beta'(1_{v_j}) < \beta'(3)$ (up to interchanging the roles of α' and β'). For a contradiction, assume that this is not the case. Then, there exists an element $1_{v_{j'}} \in D$, such that one of the followings holds:

(i) $\alpha'(2) < \alpha'(1_{v_{j'}})$,

(ii) $\beta'(1_{v_{j'}}) < \min(\beta'(3), \beta'(4))$,

(iii) $\max(\beta'(3), \beta'(4)) < \beta'(1_{v_{j'}})$, or

(iv) $\beta'(3) < \beta'(1_{v_{j'}}) < \beta'(4)$.

Let δ be the restriction of α' to $\{1_{v_{j'}}, 2, 3, 4\}$ and, similarly, let δ' be the restriction of β' to the same four-element set. Regardless of which of (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) holds, we obtain two linear orderings on $\{1_{v_{j'}}, 2, 3, 4\}$ of which at least one is different from $(1_{v_{j'}}, 2, 3, 4)$ and $(2, 4, 1_{v_{j'}}, 3)$. This contradicts the fact that, by Lemma 2, the instance $(\{1_{v_{j'}}, 2, 3, 4\}, \mathcal{C}(v_{j'}))$ of 2-Π_6, whose set of constraints is a subset of $\mathcal{C}'$, has the unique solution $(1_{v_{j'}}, 2, 3, 4)$ and $(2, 4, 1_{v_{j'}}, 3)$. For the remainder of the proof, we may therefore assume that, for each $1_{v_j} \in D$ with $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, we have $\alpha'(1_{v_j}) < \alpha'(2)$ and $\beta'(4) < \beta'(1_{v_j}) < \beta'(3)$.

Now, let α be the linear ordering of V that is obtained from $\alpha' - \{2, 3, 4\}$ by replacing each 1_{v_j} with v_j for $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. Similarly, let β be the linear ordering of V that is obtained from $\beta' - \{2, 3, 4\}$ by replacing each 1_{v_j} with v_j. Consider an element $C^i = (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i)$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and its three corresponding constraints in $\mathcal{C}_2$. If $\alpha'(1_{v_1^i}) < \min(\alpha'(1_{v_2^i}), \alpha'(1_{v_3^i}))$ or $\beta'(1_{v_1^i}) < \min(\beta'(1_{v_2^i}), \beta'(1_{v_3^i}))$, then it is easily checked that C^i is Π_1-satisfied by α or β. Otherwise, as α' and β' is a solution to $\mathcal{I}'$, we have $\alpha'(1_{v_2^i}) < \alpha'(1_{v_3^i}) < \alpha(1_{v_1^i})$ and $\beta'(1_{v_3^i}) < \beta'(1_{v_2^i}) < \beta'(1_{v_1^i})$ (up to interchanging the roles of α' and β'). In particular, by Lemma 2 and the argument in the last paragraph, we have

$$\alpha'(1_{v_2^i}) < \alpha'(1_{v_3^i}) < \alpha(1_{v_1^i}) < \alpha'(2) < \alpha'(3) < \alpha'(4)$$

and

$$\beta'(2) < \beta'(4) < \beta'(1_{v_3^i}) < \beta'(1_{v_2^i}) < \beta'(1_{v_1^i}) < \beta'(3).$$

It now follows that $(1_{v_1^i}, 1_{v_2^i}, 3)$ is neither Π_6-satisfied by α' nor Π_6-satisfied by β'; a contradiction. Thus, we have $\alpha'(1_{v_1^i}) < \min(\alpha'(1_{v_2^i}), \alpha'(1_{v_3^i}))$ or $\beta'(1_{v_1^i}) < \min(\beta'(1_{v_2^i}), \beta'(1_{v_3^i}))$; thereby implying that C^i is Π_1-satisfied by α or β. Thus, $\mathcal{I}$ is 2-Π_1-satisfiable.

The theorem now follows by combining both cases. □

Lemma 3. *Let $V = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$, and let $\gamma = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)$ and $\gamma' = (2, 5, 7, 3, 1, 6, 4)$ be two linear orderings of V. Then the instance $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\gamma) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\gamma'))$ of 2-Π_9 has a unique solution (up to reversal). In particular, each solution of $\mathcal{I}$ consists of one element from $\{\gamma, \bar{\gamma}\}$ and one element from $\{\gamma', \bar{\gamma}'\}$.*

Proof. Computational proof (see appendix). □

Theorem 6. *The problem 2-Π_9 is NP-complete.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} = (V, \mathcal{C})$ be an instance of 1-Π_5 with $\mathcal{C} = \{C^1, C^2, \ldots, C^n\}$. Furthermore, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, let $C^i = (v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i)$, with $\{v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i\} \subseteq V$. We next reduce $\mathcal{I}$ to an instance of 2-Π_9. For each $C^i \in \mathcal{C}$, let V^i be the set $\{1^i, 2^i, 3^i, 5^i, v_1^i, v_2^i, v_3^i\}$ of variables, let $\gamma^i = (1^i, 2^i, 3^i, v_1^i, 5^i, v_2^i, v_3^i)$ and $\delta^i = (2^i, 5^i, v_3^i, 3^i, 1^i, v_2^i, v_1^i)$ be two linear orderings of V^i. By replacing the variables 4, 6, and 7 with v_1^i, v_2^i, and v_3^i, respectively, in the statement of Lemma 3, note that a solution to the instance $(V^i, \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\gamma^i) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\delta^i))$ of 2-Π_9 consists of one element from $\{\gamma^i, \bar{\gamma}^i\}$ and one element from $\{\delta^i, \bar{\delta}^i\}$. Now, let $\mathcal{I}' = (V', \mathcal{C}')$ be an instance of 2-Π_9 with

$$V' = \bigcup_{i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}} V^i$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}' = \bigcup_{i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}} (\mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\gamma^i) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\delta^i)).$$

Since the number of elements in $\mathcal{C}'$ and V' is polynomial in n, the reduction can be carried out in polynomial time. To complete the proof, we show that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable if and only if $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_9-satisfiable.

First, suppose that $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable. Then there exists a linear ordering α on V such that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}$ is Π_5-satisfied by α. Let α' be a linear ordering of V' obtained from α by preserving α and adding all elements in $V' - V$ such that, for each $C^i \in \mathcal{C}$, the constraints in $\mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\gamma^i)$ are Π_9-satisfied. More precisely, if $\alpha(v_1^i) < \alpha(v_2^i) < \alpha(v_3^i)$, then

$$\alpha'(1^i) < \alpha'(2^i) < \alpha'(3^i) < \alpha'(v_1^i) < \alpha'(5^i) < \alpha'(v_2^i) < \alpha'(v_3^i)$$

and, if $\alpha(v_3^i) < \alpha(v_2^i) < \alpha(v_1^i)$, then

$$\alpha'(v_3^i) < \alpha'(v_2^i) < \alpha'(5^i) < \alpha'(v_1^i) < \alpha'(3^i) < \alpha'(2^i) < \alpha'(1^i).$$

Similarly, let β' be a linear ordering of V' obtained from α by preserving α and adding all elements in $V' - V$ such that, for each $C^i \in \mathcal{C}$, the constraints in $\mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\delta^i)$ are Π_9-satisfied. More precisely, if $\alpha(v_1^i) < \alpha(v_2^i) < \alpha(v_3^i)$, then

$$\beta'(v_1^i) < \beta'(v_2^i) < \beta'(1^i) < \beta'(3^i) < \beta'(v_3^i) < \beta'(5^i) < \beta'(2^i)$$

and, if $\alpha(v_3^i) < \alpha(v_2^i) < \alpha(v_1^i)$, then

$$\beta'(2^i) < \beta'(5^i) < \beta'(v_3^i) < \beta'(3^i) < \beta'(1^i) < \beta'(v_2^i) < \beta'(v_1^i).$$

By repeated applications of Lemma 3, it now follows that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}'$ is Π_9-satisfied by α' or β' and, thus, $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_9-satisfiable.

Second, suppose that $\mathcal{I}'$ is 2-Π_9-satisfiable. Then there exist two linear orderings α' and β' on V' such that each constraint in $\mathcal{C}'$ is Π_9-satisfied by α' or β'. It follows from Lemma 3 that, each solution to the instance $(V^i, \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\gamma^i) \cup \mathcal{C}_{\Pi_9}(\delta^i))$ consists of one element from $\{\gamma^i, \bar{\gamma}^i\}$ and one element from $\{\delta^i, \bar{\delta}^i\}$. We will show that the result holds if α' preserves γ^i and if that β' preserves δ^i, noting that symmetrical arguments hold as long as one linear order preserves one element from $\{\gamma^i, \bar{\gamma}^i\}$ and the other linear order preserves one element from $\{\delta^i, \bar{\delta}^i\}$. Let α be the linear ordering $\alpha' - (V' - V)$ on V. Since, for each $C^i \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $\alpha'(v_1^i) < \alpha'(v_2^i) < \alpha'(v_3^i)$ or $\alpha'(v_3^i) < \alpha'(v_2^i) < \alpha'(v_1^i)$, it is easily checked that C^i is Π_5 satisfied by α and thus, $\mathcal{I}$ is 1-Π_5-satisfiable.

The theorem now follows by combining both cases. □

4 Three linear orderings and an extension to phylogenetic trees

In the last section, we have shown that 2-Π_1 is NP-complete. In this section we first show that the problem remains computationally hard if we allow for three instead of only two linear orderings. More formally, we show that 3-Caterpillar Compatibility is NP-complete and, hence, by Observation 1, 3-Π_1 is NP-complete as well.

In the second part of the section, we extend the hardness result of 3-Caterpillar Compatibility and show that the following decision problem is NP-complete.

3-Tree Compatibility
Instance. A set $\mathcal{R}$ of rooted triplets.

Question. Do there exist at most three rooted phylogenetic trees such that each element in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by at least one such tree?

In the flavor of Section 3, we start with a lemma whose proof is computational. It shows that the three caterpillars shown in Figure 2 are uniquely defined by their induced triplets, not just in the space of caterpillars but also in the wider space of phylogenetic trees.

Lemma 4. *Let C_1, C_2, and C_3 be the three caterpillars that are shown in Figure 2, and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of all triplets that are displayed by C_1, C_2, or C_3. Then, for each set of three trees, say T_1, T_2, and T_3, that is a solution to* 3-Tree Compatibility *with input $\mathcal{C}$, we have $C_1 = T_1|\{0,1,\ldots,5\}$, $C_2 = T_2|\{0,1,\ldots,5\}$, and $C_3 = T_3|\{0,1,\ldots,5\}$.*

Proof. Computational proof (see appendix). □



Figure 2: The three trees that are used in the proofs of Lemma 4, and Theorems 7 and 8.

To prove the first main result of this section (Theorem 7), we need a new definition. Let e and f be two leaves of a caterpillar C. If there exists a directed path from the parent of f to e in C, we say that e is *below* f or, equivalently, f is *above* e in D and write $e \prec f$.

Theorem 7. *The problems* 3-Caterpillar Compatibility *and, hence,* 3-Π_1 *are NP-complete.*

Proof. Trivially, 3-Caterpillar Compatibility is in NP. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility, i.e. $\mathcal{I}$ is a set of triplets. To show that the theorem holds, we reduce $\mathcal{I}$ to an instance of 3-Caterpillar Compatibility. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of triplets as defined in the statement of Lemma 4. Furthermore, we define the following five sets of triplets, where, for each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$, $\underline{ab}$ denotes a new taxon that is not a leaf label of a triplet in $\mathcal{I}$.

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \bigcup_{ab|c\in\mathcal{I}} \{3a|5, 3a|1, 4a|0, 3b|5, 3b|1, 4b|0, 3c|5, 3c|1, 4c|0, 3\underline{ab}|5, 3\underline{ab}|1, 4\underline{ab}|0\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2 = \bigcup_{ab|c\in\mathcal{I}} \{4\underline{ab}|2\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_3 = \bigcup_{ab|c\in\mathcal{I}} \{0\underline{ab}|c\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_4 = \bigcup_{ab|c\in\mathcal{I}} \{25|a, 12|a, 0a|2, 25|b, 12|b, 0b|2\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_5 = \bigcup_{ab|c\in\mathcal{I}} \{5a|\underline{ab}, 5b|\underline{ab}, 1a|\underline{ab}, 1b|\underline{ab}\}.$$

Now, let $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_2 \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{R}_5$. Clearly, the number of elements in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ is polynomial in 6 and $|\mathcal{I}|$, respectively. To complete the proof, we show that $\mathcal{I}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility if and only if $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 3-Caterpillar Compatibility.

First, suppose that $\mathcal{I}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility. Then, there exist two caterpillars S_1 and S_2 such that each triplet in $\mathcal{I}$ is displayed by S_1 or S_2. Illustrated in Figure 3, we obtain three new caterpillars T_1, T_2, and T_3 as follows. For $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, start by setting $T_i = C_i$, where C_i is the caterpillar shown in Figure 2 and insert S_1 into T_1 below 2 and above 1, and S_2 into T_2 below 2 and above 5. It is easily checked that the resulting trees display all triplets in $\mathcal{C}$. Furthermore, for each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$ that is displayed by S_1, add the corresponding $\underline{ab}$ taxon to T_1 such that $\underline{ab}$ is above a and b and below c and add $\underline{ab}$ to T_2 such that $\underline{ab}$ is above a and b, and below 2. Similarly, for each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$ that is not displayed by S_1, add the corresponding $\underline{ab}$ taxon to T_2 such that $\underline{ab}$ is is above a and b and below c and add $\underline{ab}$ to T_1 such that $\underline{ab}$ is above a and b, and below 2. Lastly, for each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$, add each taxon in $\{a, b, \underline{ab}\}$ to T_3 such that $4 \prec \underline{ab} \prec 2 \prec a$, $2 \prec a \prec 0$, and $2 \prec b \prec 0$ holds. We next show that each triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by at least one tree of T_1, T_2, and T_3. For each $x \in \{a, b, c, \underline{ab}\}$, the triplet $3x|5$ is displayed by T_1, the triplet $3x|1$ is displayed by T_2, and the triplet $4x|0$ is displayed by T_3. Hence, each triplet in $\mathcal{R}_1$ is displayed by T_1, T_2, or T_3. Furthermore, each triplet in $\mathcal{R}_2$ is displayed by T_3 and, depending on whether or not a triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$ is displayed by S_1, the corresponding triplet in $\mathcal{R}_3$ is displayed by T_1 or T_2. Turning, to the triplets in $\mathcal{R}_4$, a straightforward check shows that, for each $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$, the two corresponding triplets $0a|2$ and $0b|2$ in $\mathcal{R}_4$ are displayed by T_1 (and T_2), while the remaining four triplets in $\mathcal{R}_4$ are displayed by T_3. Lastly, for each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$, the first two corresponding triplets in $\mathcal{R}_5$ are displayed by T_2 while the last two corresponding triplets in $\mathcal{R}_5$ are displayed by T_1. Hence, each triplet in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is displayed by one of T_1, T_2, or T_3 and, therefore, $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 3-Caterpillar Compatibility.



Figure 3: Right: A solution T_1, T_2, and T_3 to the transformed instance of 3-Caterpillar Compatibility, given a solution S_1 and S_2 to some 2-Caterpillar Compatibility instance. Left: A more detailed view of the part of the caterpillar T_1 inside the dotted circle.

Second, suppose that $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 3-Caterpillar Compatibility. Then, there exist three caterpillars T_1, T_2, and T_3 such that each triplet in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is displayed by T_1, T_2, or T_3. By Lemma 4, we may assume without loss of generality that $C_1 = T_1|\{0, 1, \ldots, 5\}$, $C_2 = T_2|\{0, 1, \ldots, 5\}$, and $C_3 = T_3|\{0, 1, \ldots, 5\}$, where C_1, C_2, and C_3 are the three caterpillars that are shown in Figure 2. We make three observations that follow from the different triplet sets $\mathcal{R}_1$, $\mathcal{R}_2$, and $\mathcal{R}_3$. Let $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$.

(1) For each $x \in \{a, b, c, \underline{ab}\}$, the triplet $3x|5$ is only displayed by T_1, the triplet $3x|1$ is only displayed by T_2, and the triplet $4x|0$ is only displayed by T_3. In particular the root of T_1

is the parent of 5 and, similarly, the root of T_2 (resp. T_3) is the parent of 1 (resp. 0).

(2) The triplet $4\underline{ab}|2$ is only displayed by T_3 and, as a consequence, $\underline{ab}$ is below 2 in T_3.

(3) By Observation (1), the triplet $0\underline{ab}|c$ is not displayed by T_3 and, hence, $\underline{ab}$ is below c in T_1 or T_2.

Now consider the triplets in $\mathcal{R}_4$. We claim that, for each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$, the two taxa a and b are above 2 in T_3. Assume that a is not above 2 in T_3. Then, by Observation (1), $25|a$ is only displayed by T_2 and $12|a$ is only displayed by T_1 and, therefore, a is above 2 in both of T_1 and T_2. Hence, $0a|2$ is not displayed by T_1 or T_2 and, by Observation (1), certainly not by T_3; a contradiction. Similarly, assume that b is not above 2 in T_3. Then, by Observation (1), $25|b$ is only displayed by T_2 and $12|b$ is only displayed by T_1 and, therefore, b is above 2 in both T_1 and T_2. Hence, $0b|2$ is not displayed by T_1 or T_2 and, by Observation (1), certainly not by T_3; a contradiction. Now, since a and b are both above 2 in T_3, it follows from Observation (2) that a and b are both above $\underline{ab}$ in T_3. In turn, this implies that T_3 does not display a triplet $ya|\underline{ab}$ or $yb|\underline{ab}$ with $y \in \{1, 5\}$. Finally consider the triplets in $\mathcal{R}_5$. For each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$, the triplets $5a|\underline{ab}$ and $5b|\underline{ab}$ are only displayed by T_2 due to Observation (1) and the previous claim. Similarly, the triplets $1a|\underline{ab}$ and $1b|\underline{ab}$ are only displayed by T_1 due to Observation (1) and the previous claim. Hence, $\underline{ab}$ is above a and b in both T_1 and T_2. Now, recall that $\underline{ab}$ is below c in at least one of T_1 or T_2 by Observation (3). It follows that each $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$ is displayed by T_1 or T_2. and, therefore, $\mathcal{I}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility. By combining both cases, it follows that 3-Caterpillar Compatibility is NP-complete and, hence, by Observation 1, 3-Π_1 is also NP-complete. □

For a given set of triplets, we next show that it is not only NP-complete to decide if there exist three caterpillars such that each element in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by at least one of these caterpillars, but also NP-complete to decide if there exist three (arbitrary) rooted phylogenetic trees such that each element in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by at least one of these trees. We start with a few new definitions.

Let T be a caterpillar. Furthermore, let $\{c, c'\}$ be the unique cherry in T and let x be the leaf of T such that the directed path from the root of T to x contains precisely one edge. We refer to the directed path from the root of T to the parent of c as the *spine* of T and to each other edge in T as a *leg* of T. Note that the definitions of spine and leg naturally carry over to each tree obtained from T by subdividing edges of T except for the edges directed into c, c', and x respectively. We call such a tree a *relaxed caterpillar*. Lastly, a rooted subtree of a rooted phylogenetic tree T is *pendant* if it can be detached from $\mathcal{T}$ by deleting a single edge. Note that each leaf of T is a pendant subtree of T.

Theorem 8. *The problem* 3-Tree Compatibility *is NP-complete.*

Proof. The proof of this theorem is similar to that of Theorem 7. Trivially, 3-Tree Compatibility is in NP. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility, i.e. $\mathcal{I}$ is a set of triplets. To show that the theorem holds, we reduce $\mathcal{I}$ to an instance of 3-Tree Compatibility. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of triplets as defined in the statement of Lemma 4. Furthermore, we define the following six sets of triplets, where, for each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$, $\underline{ab}$ denotes a new taxon that is not a leaf label of a triplet in $\mathcal{I}$.

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \bigcup_{ab|c \in \mathcal{I}} \bigcup_{x \in \{a,b,c,\underline{ab}\}} \{2x|5, 3x|5, 4x|5, 2x|1, 3x|1, 4x|1, 2x|0, 3x|0, 4x|0\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2 = \bigcup_{ab|c \in \mathcal{I}} \{01|a, 05|a, 01|b, 05|b, 01|c, 05|c, 01|\underline{ab}, 05|\underline{ab}\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_3 = \bigcup_{ab|c \in \mathcal{I}} \{3\underline{ab}|2, 4\underline{ab}|2, 5\underline{ab}|2\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_4 = \bigcup_{ab|c \in \mathcal{I}} \{0\underline{ab}|c\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_5 = \bigcup_{ab|c \in \mathcal{I}} \{25|a, 12|a, 0a|2, 25|b, 12|b, 0b|2\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_6 = \bigcup_{ab|c \in \mathcal{I}} \{5a|\underline{ab}, 5b|\underline{ab}, 1a|\underline{ab}, 1b|\underline{ab}\}.$$

Note that only $\mathcal{R}_1$, $\mathcal{R}_2$, and $\mathcal{R}_3$ contain triplets that are not used in the reduction presented in the proof of Theorem 7. Now, let $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_2 \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{R}_6$. Clearly, the number of elements in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ is polynomial in 6 and $|\mathcal{I}|$, respectively. To complete the proof, we show that $\mathcal{I}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility if and only if $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 3-Tree Compatibility.

First, suppose that $\mathcal{I}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility. Then, there exist two caterpillars S_1 and S_2 such that each triplet in $\mathcal{I}$ is displayed by S_1 or S_2. Let T_1, T_2, and T_3 be the same phylogenetic trees (caterpillars) reconstructed from S_1 and S_2 as in the proof of Theorem 7. Building on this proof, it remains to show that all triplets in $\mathcal{R}_1$, $\mathcal{R}_2$, and $\mathcal{R}_3$ are displayed by at least one of T_1, T_2, and T_3. For each $x \in \{a, b, c, \underline{ab}\}$, the triplets $2x|5$, $3x|5$, and $4x|5$ are displayed by T_1, the triplets $2x|1$, $3x|1$, and $4x|1$ are displayed by T_2, and the triplets $2x|0$, $3x|0$, $4x|0$ are displayed by T_3. Hence, each triplet in $\mathcal{R}_1$ is displayed by T_1, T_2, or T_3. Furthermore, turning to the triplets in $\mathcal{R}_2$, each triplet $01|x$ is displayed by T_1 and each triplet $05|x$ is displayed by T_2. Lastly, each triplet in $\mathcal{R}_3$ is displayed by T_3. In conclusion, each triplet in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is displayed by one of T_1, T_2, or T_3 and, therefore, $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 3-Tree Compatibility.

Second, suppose that $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 3-Tree Compatibility. Then, there exist three trees T_1, T_2, and T_3 such that each triplet in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{R}$ is displayed by T_1, T_2, or T_3. Again, by Lemma 4, we may assume without loss of generality that $C_1 = T_1|\{0, 1, \ldots, 5\}$, $C_2 = T_2|\{0, 1, \ldots, 5\}$, and $C_3 = T_3|\{0, 1, \ldots, 5\}$, where C_1, C_2, and C_3 are the three caterpillars that are shown in Figure 2. For the remainder of the proof, we relax the definition of 'above' (resp. 'below') as defined prior to the proof of Theorem 7. In particular, for two leaves x and y in $L(T_i)$ with $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we say that x is *below* y or, equivalently, y is *above* x if there is a directed path from $\mathrm{lca}_{T_i}(c, y)$ to $\mathrm{lca}_{T_i}(c, x)$ that contains at least one edge and where c is a leaf of the cherry in C_i. We next consider the triplets in $\mathcal{R}$. Let $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$.

(1) We claim that the root of T_1 is the parent of 5. To see that this is indeed true, consider the triplets $2x|5, 3x|5, 4x|5$ with $x \in \{a, b, c, \underline{ab}\}$. For x being fixed, no two of these three triplets can simultaneously be displayed by T_2 or T_3. Hence, at least one such triplet is only displayed by T_1; thereby implying the correctness of the claim. A similar argument can be used to show that the parent of 1 is the root of T_2 (by exploiting the triplets $2x|1$, $3x|1$, and $4x|1$) and that the parent of 0 is the root of T_3 (by exploiting the triplets $2x|0$, $3x|0$, and $4x|0$).

(2) By Observation (1), the triplets in $\mathcal{R}_2$ guarantee that, for each $x \in \{a, b, c, \underline{ab}\}$, the triplet $01|x$ is only displayed by T_1 and the triplet $05|x$ is only displayed by T_2. In other words $\{0, 1\}$ is a cherry of T_1 and $\{0, 5\}$ is a cherry of T_2.

(3) At least one of the three corresponding triplets in $\mathcal{R}_3$ is only displayed by T_3 and, hence, $\underline{ab}$ is below 2 in T_3.

(4) By Observation (1), the triplet $0\underline{ab}|c$ in $\mathcal{R}_4$ is not displayed by T_3 and, hence, $\underline{ab}$ is below c in T_1 or T_2.

(5) Considering $\mathcal{R}_5$ and using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 7, it follows that a and b are above 2 in T_3.

(6) By Observations (3) and (5), no triplet in $\mathcal{R}_6$ is displayed by T_3. Moreover, due to Observation (1), we have that $5a|\underline{ab}$ and $5b|\underline{ab}$ are only displayed by T_2 and that $1a|\underline{ab}$ and $1b|\underline{ab}$ are only displayed by T_1; thereby implying that $\underline{ab}$ is above a and b in T_1 and T_2.

Now, by combining Observations (2), (4) and (6), it now follows that each $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$ is displayed by T_1 or T_2.

Guided by T_1 and T_2, we next construct two caterpillars S_1 and S_2. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let C'_i be the relaxed caterpillar $T_i(\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\})$, and let c_i be a leaf of the cherry in C'_i. By Observations (1) and (2), note that C'_i is indeed a relaxed caterpillar. Now, let $S_i = T_i$. For each maximum-size pendant subtree S of S_i whose leaf set $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ is a subset of $L(S_i) - \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, repeat the following (illustrated in Figure 4) until the resulting trees are both caterpillars. If S can be detached from S_i by deleting an edge (u_1, v) such that u_1 corresponds to a degree-2 vertex on the spine of C'_i, then delete (u_1, v), subdivide the edge directed into u_1 with $n-1$ new vertices $u_2, u_3, \ldots, u_n$, and, for each $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, add a new edge (u_j, x_j). Otherwise, S can be detached from S_i by deleting an edge (u, v) such that u corresponds to a degree-2 vertex on a leg of C'_i. Let ℓ be the unique element in $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ such that there is a directed path from u to ℓ in S_i. Then, delete (u, v) and contract the resulting degree-2 vertex u, subdivide the edge directed into $\mathrm{lca}_{S_i}(c_i, \ell)$ with n new vertices $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n$, and, for each $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, add a new edge (u_j, x_j).



Figure 4: The construction of a caterpillar T'_1 from T_1 as described in the second part of the proof of Theorem 8.

We complete the proof by showing that each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$ is displayed by S_1 or S_2. Intuitively, the transformation from trees into caterpillars is safe because, for any two leaves in

$L(T_i)$ with $i \in \{1,2\}$ for which the 'above'-relationship holds in T_i, the 'above'-relationship also holds in S_i.

To ease reading in this part of the proof, we pause and introduce new terminology. Let S be a subtree of T_i with $L(S) \subseteq L(T_i) - \{0,1,2,3,4,5\}$. If S can be detached from T_i by deleting an edge (u,v) such that u corresponds to a degree-2 vertex on the spine of C_i', we call S a *spine subtree* of T_i. Otherwise, we call S, an *ℓ-leg subtree* of T_i, where ℓ is the unique element in $\{0,1,2,3,4,5\}$ such that there exists a directed path from u to ℓ in T_i. Now, let $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$.

First, assume that $0\underline{ab}|c$ is displayed by T_1. (Then, because $1a|\underline{ab}$ and $1b|\underline{ab}$ are definitely displayed by T_1, $ab|c$ is displayed by T_1.) Since T_1 displays $0\underline{ab}|c$, $1a|\underline{ab}$ and $1b|\underline{ab}$, it follows that there does not exist a spine or leg subtree S in T_1 with $\{a,b,c\} \subseteq L(S)$. Clearly, a and c cannot be together in a leg or spine subtree without b, and similarly b and c cannot be together without a, because this would contradict the fact that T_1 displays $ab|c$. So suppose a and b are together without c in a leg or spine subtree. Due to the fact that $0\underline{ab}|c$, $1a|\underline{ab}$ and $1b|\underline{ab}$ are displayed by T_1, the transformation ensures that in S_1 there is a directed path from the parent of c to $\mathrm{lca}_{T_1}(a,b)$ i.e. that $ab|c$ is displayed. Let us then consider the remaining case when a, b and c are in three distinct subtrees (spine or leg). Observe that it is not possible for all three distinct subtrees to be ℓ-leg subtrees, for the same ℓ. This, again, is because of the three triplets $0\underline{ab}|c$, $1a|\underline{ab}$ and $1b|\underline{ab}$. Hence, at most a and b can be in distinct ℓ-leg subtrees, for the same ℓ. Under such circumstances the transformation again ensures that $ab|c$ will be displayed by S_1.

Second, assume that $0\underline{ab}|c$ is displayed by T_2 (and hence $ab|c$ is displayed by T_2). By replacing the triplets $1a|\underline{ab}$ and $1b|\underline{ab}$ with $5a|\underline{ab}$ and $5b|\underline{ab}$, respectively, we can use an analogous argument to show that $ab|c$ is displayed by S_2. In conclusion, each triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{I}$ is displayed by the caterpillar S_1 or S_2 and, thus, $\mathcal{I}$ is a 'yes'-instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility.

By combining both cases, and noting that the construction described in the previous paragraph of this proof can be done in polynomial time, it follows that 3-Tree Compatibility is NP-complete. □

5 A constant number of trees is not enough

We begin this section with several new definitions. Let T be an unrooted binary phylogenetic tree, and let T_r be a rooted binary phylogenetic tree. We say that T_r is a *rooting* of T if T_r can be obtained from T by subdividing an edge e of T by a new vertex ρ, which is regarded as the root, and directing all edges away from ρ. The edge e is then called the *root location* of T_r in T. The next definition introduces a special set of rooted triplets that will play an important role throughout this section. Let $\mathcal{T}_n$ denote the full set of triplets over n leaves, i.e.

$$\mathcal{T}_n = \{ab|c \quad : \quad a,b,c \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}, \quad a \neq b \neq c \neq a\}.$$

Furthermore, we use $\tau(n)$ to denote the minimum number of binary rooted phylogenetic trees of order n, such that each triplet in $\mathcal{T}_n$ is displayed by at least one of these trees.

We will show that $\tau(n) \to \infty$ when $n \to \infty$. In other words, we show that a constant number of trees does not suffice to display all possible triplet sets.

To prove this, we will use the following theorem shown by Martin and Thatte [13], which improves an earlier bound by Székely and Steel [19]. Let $\mathrm{umast}_k(n)$ denote the smallest number L such that, for any collection $\mathcal{C}$ of k binary unrooted phylogenetic trees of order n, there exists a binary unrooted phylogenetic tree T^* of order L that is displayed by each tree in $\mathcal{C}$.

Theorem 9 (Martin and Thatte). *For some constant $c > 0$,*

$$umast_2(n) > c\sqrt{\log(n)}.$$

To use the above theorem, we first extend it to more than 2 trees.

Lemma 5. *For some constant $c > 0$ and $k > 2$,*

$$umast_k(n) > c\sqrt{\log(umast_{k-1}(n))}.$$

Proof. Let $k \geq 3$. Consider a collection $\mathcal{C}$ of k unrooted phylogenetic trees of order n. Consider an arbitrary $k-1$-sized subset $\mathcal{C}'$ of $\mathcal{C}$ and let T^* be the only tree in $\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}'$. Let T' be an unrooted phylogenetic tree that is displayed by each tree in $\mathcal{C}'$ and has order $\text{umast}_{k-1}(n)$ (i.e. it has a maximum number of leaves). Let T^{**} be the unique subtree of T^* that has the same leaf set as T'. By Theorem 9, there exists an unrooted phylogenetic tree $T^{'**}$ that is displayed by both T' and T^{**} and has order $\text{umast}_2(\text{umast}_{k-1}(n)) > c\sqrt{\log(\text{umast}_{k-1}(n))}$. Since $T^{'**}$ is displayed by each tree in $\mathcal{C}$, the lemma follows. □

The following lemma follows directly from Theorem 9 and Lemma 5 by induction on k.

Lemma 6. *For all $k \in N$, $umast_k(n) \to \infty$ when $n \to \infty$.*

We now make the step from unrooted to rooted trees by proving the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let T be a binary unrooted phylogenetic tree of order $n \geq 4$ and let $T_1, \ldots, T_k$ be k rootings of T. If $n > k^2 - 6$, then there exists a triplet in $\mathcal{T}_n$ that is not displayed by any of $T_1, \ldots, T_k$.*

Proof. Let $c \geq 2$ be the number of cherries (i.e. pairs of leaves with a common neighbour) of T. Let ℓ be the length of the longest chain (i.e. a path of which each vertex is adjacent to exactly one leaf) of T.

We claim that T has at most $2c-3$ chains. To see this, consider the tree T^* obtained from T by deleting all leaves and subsequently suppressing all degree-2 vertices. Then, T^* has c leaves and hence $2c-3$ edges. Each chain of T corresponds to an edge of T^* and hence T has at most $2c-3$ chains.

First assume that $k < 2c$. Then there exists some cherry $\{a, b\}$ such that at most one of the edges incident to a and b is a root location of at least one of the trees $T_1, \ldots, T_k$ in T. Say that the edge incident to a is not a root location and let c be any leaf distinct from a and b. Then it can easily be checked that the triplet $bc|a$ is not displayed by any of $T_1, \ldots, T_k$.

Now assume that $k \geq 2c$. Tree T has at most 2 leaves per cherry plus at most ℓ leaves per chain, hence

$$n \leq 2c + \ell(2c-3).$$

It follows that

$$\ell \geq \frac{n-2c}{2c-3} \geq \frac{n-k}{k-3}.$$

Now, since $n > k^2 - 6$, it follows that $\ell > k+2$.

Consider some chain C of T with length at least $k+3$. Since there are at most k edges that are root locations of the trees $T_1, \ldots, T_k$ in T, there exists some subpath (u, v, w) of C, with a, b, c being the leaves adjacent to u, v, w respectively, such that the edge from v to b is not a root location. Then it can easily be checked that the triplet $ac|b$ is not displayed by any of $T_1, \ldots, T_k$. □

We can now prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 10. *$\tau(n) \to \infty$ when $n \to \infty$*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that there exists some natural number K such that $\tau(n) \leq K$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 6, there exists a natural number $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\text{umast}_K(N) > K^2 - 6$. Let $\mathcal{C}_r$ be a collection of K binary rooted phylogenetic trees of order N such that each triplet in $\mathcal{T}_N$ is displayed by at least one tree in $\mathcal{C}_r$. Such a collection exists by the assumption that $\tau(N) \leq K$.

Let $\mathcal{C}_u$ be the collection of unrooted trees obtained from $\mathcal{C}_r$ by omitting the orientations of the edges and suppressing the vertices with degree 2 (the former roots). Then there exists some binary unrooted phylogenetic tree T_u that is displayed by each tree in $\mathcal{C}_u$ and has order $\text{umast}_K(N)$. Let L be the leaf-set of T_u and consider the set of rooted trees $\mathcal{C}_r|L$ obtained by restricting $\mathcal{C}_r$ to L, i.e. for each tree $T \in \mathcal{C}_r$, the set $\mathcal{C}_r|L$ contains the tree obtained from the smallest subtree of T containing all elements of L by suppressing all indegree-1 outdegree-1 vertices. Observe that each tree in $\mathcal{C}_r|L$ is a rooting of T_u and has order $\text{umast}_K(N)$. Hence, since $\text{umast}_K(N) > K^2-6$, it follows from Lemma 7 that there exists some triplet $ab|c \in \mathcal{T}_N$ that is not displayed by any tree in $\mathcal{C}_r|L$. Hence, $ab|c$ is not displayed by any tree in $\mathcal{C}_r$. This contradicts our assumption that each triplet in $\mathcal{T}_N$ is displayed by at least one tree in $\mathcal{C}_r$. □

Let $\tau_c(n)$ be the minimum number of binary rooted *caterpillar* trees of order n, such that each triplet in $\mathcal{T}_n$ is displayed by at least one of these trees. Clearly, $\tau(n) \leq \tau_c(n)$. We have the following logarithmic upper bound:

Lemma 8. $\tau(n) \leq \tau_c(n) \leq \left\lceil \frac{\log n(n-1)(n-2) - \log 2}{\log(3/2)} \right\rceil$

Proof. It is well known that, given a set of triplets, it is possible to find in polynomial time a tree (in fact, a caterpillar) that is consistent with at least 1/3 of the triplets, see [4] for a discussion. Observe that $|\mathcal{T}_n| = 3\binom{n}{3}$ and that a triplet set containing only one triplet is trivially compatible. Combining these facts shows that k caterpillars are sufficient to display all triplets in $\mathcal{T}_n$, where k is the smallest integer that satisfies the following inequality:

$$3\binom{n}{3}(2/3)^k \leq 1$$

Rearranging for k gives the desired result. □

The lower bound implicit in Theorem 10 and the upper bound in Lemma 8 are very weak. To highlight this we computed $\tau(n)$ and $\tau_c(n)$ exactly for small values of n using Integer Linear Programming (ILP). We defer the details of the ILP to the appendix. The results are shown in the following table. For $n \geq 13$ the ILP for computation of $\tau(n)$ did not terminate in reasonable time, but the slightly more constrainted ILP for computation of $\tau_c(n)$ did.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	$13 \leq n \leq 20$
$\tau(n)$	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	≤ 5
$\tau_c(n)$	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5
Lemma 8 bound	3	7	9	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	17-21

The possibility thus remains that, for all n, $\tau(n) = \tau_c(n)$. Resolving this is an interesting open problem. We do however already know that for some triplet sets with fewer than $3\binom{n}{3}$ triplets the minimum number of caterpillars required is strictly larger than the minimum number of trees required. For example, the set of triplets $\{13|4, 14|2, 14|3, 23|1, 24|1\}$ requires at least 3 caterpillars but only 2 trees. This can be verified by hand or by a simple adaptation of the ILP.

6 Open problems

For each problem 2-Π_i that is polynomial-time solveable, we know that all instances of the problem are "yes" instances, which means that k-Π_i is actually polynomial-time solveable for all $k \geq 2$. An obvious conjecture is that for each problem 2-Π_i that has been shown to be NP-complete in this article, k-Π_i is actually NP-complete for all $k \geq 2$. However, generalizing the gadgetry used in this article will probably require a considerable effort and need to go beyond auxiliary computational proofs. In the same spirit, it seems plausible that k-Tree Compatibility is hard for every $k \geq 3$. The fact that $\tau(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ means that the problem in any case does not become trivially polynomial-time solveable for a sufficiently large, constant number of trees. Other challenges include tightening the bounds on $\tau(n)$ and $\tau_c(n)$ and determining whether $\tau(n) = \tau_c(n)$ for all n. In the applied domain, it will be interesting to explore whether the slow growth of $\tau(n)$ has implications for analysis of incongruent biological datasets.

References

[1] A. V. Aho, Y. Sagiv, T. G. Szymanski, and J. D. Ullman. Inferring a tree from lowest common ancestors with an application to the optimization of relational expressions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(3):405–421, 1981.

[2] M. Bodirsky and J. Kára. The complexity of temporal constraint satisfaction problems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 57(2):9, 2010.

[3] D. Bokal, G. Fijavz, M. Juvan, P. M. Kayll, and B. Mohar. The circular chromatic number of a digraph. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 46(3):227–240, 2004.

[4] J. Byrka, P. Gawrychowski, K. T. Huber, and S. M. Kelk. Worst-case optimal approximation algorithms for maximizing triplet consistency within phylogenetic networks. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 8(1):65–75, 2010.

[5] B. Chor and M. Sudan. A geometric approach to betweenness. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 11(4):511–523, 1998.

[6] Z. Galil and N. Megiddo. Cyclic ordering is NP-complete. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 5(2):179–182, 1977.

[7] S. Guillemot and M. Mnich. Kernel and fast algorithm for dense triplet inconsistency. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 494:134–143, 2013.

[8] V. Guruswami, J. Håstad, R. Manokaran, P. Raghavendra, and M. Charikar. Beating the random ordering is hard: Every ordering CSP is approximation resistant. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(3):878–914, 2011.

[9] G. Gutin, L. J. J. van Iersel, M. Mnich, and A. Yeo. Every ternary permutation constraint satisfaction problem parameterized above average has a kernel with a quadratic number of variables. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 78(1):151–163, 2012.

[10] W. Guttmann and M. Maucher. Variations on an ordering theme with constraints. In *Fourth IFIP International Conference on Theoretical Computer Science-TCS 2006*, pages 77–90. Springer, 2006.

[11] D.H. Huson, R. Rupp, and C. Scornavacca. *Phylogenetic Networks: Concepts, Algorithms and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, UK, 2011.

[12] S. Linz, K. St John, and C. Semple. Optimizing tree and character compatibility across several phylogenetic trees. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 513:129–136, 2013.

[13] D. M. Martin and B. D. Thatte. The maximum agreement subtree problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161(13):1805–1817, 2013.

[14] D. A. Morrison. Introduction to phylogenetic networks. *RJR Productions*, 2011.

[15] L. Nakhleh. Computational approaches to species phylogeny inference and gene tree reconciliation. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 28(12):719–728, 2013.

[16] N. Nethercote, P. J. Stuckey, R. Becket, S. Brand, G. J. Duck, and G. Tack. Minizinc: Towards a standard CP modelling language. In *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming–CP 2007*, pages 529–543. Springer, 2007.

[17] V. Neumann-Lara. The dichromatic number of a digraph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 33(3):265–270, 1982.

[18] C. Semple and M. Steel. *Phylogenetics*. Oxford University Press, 2003.

[19] M. Steel and L. A. Székely. An improved bound on the maximum agreement subtree problem. *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 22(11):1778–1780, 2009.

A An alternative proof of Theorem 2

In this section, we establish an alternative proof that 2-Π_1 is NP-complete. While the proof is more involved than the one presented in Section 3, it highlights a link of 2-Π_1 to the graph-theoretic problem Dichromatic Number. As an interesting by-product, we also strengthen the hardness result for Dichromatic Number to a subclass of digraphs whose vertices have a bounded out-degree.

We start by introducing the decision problem Dichromatic Number that generalizes the concept of the chromatic number to directed graphs [17]. More formally, Dichromatic Number can be stated as follows.

Dichromatic Number
Instance. A digraph D with vertex set $V(D)$ and a positive integer k.
Question. Is D *k-dicolorable*, i.e. does there exist a vertex coloring of $V(D)$ with at most k colors such that the subgraph induced by each color does not contain any directed cycle?

It is shown in [3] that Dichromatic Number is an NP-complete problem. In particular, the authors showed that the special case of Dichromatic Number in which k is fixed to 2 is NP-complete. We refer to this variation of the problem as 2-Dichromatic Number and it is exactly this problem that we use as a starting point to show that 2-Π_1 is NP-complete.

Let D be the input to an instance $\mathcal{I}$ of 2-Dichromatic Number. Following the notation introduced above, we say that $\mathcal{I}$ is *2-dicolorable* if $\mathcal{I}$ is a 'yes'-instance and refer to any valid coloring of D with exactly two colors as a *2-dicoloring*. We will see later that a digraph that is 2-dicolorable corresponds to a carefully constructed 'yes'-instance of 2-Π_1.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a set of rooted triplets, and let X be the label set of $\mathcal{R}$. Let $D(\mathcal{R})$ be the digraph whose vertex set is X and for which (c, a) and (c, b) are arcs in $D(\mathcal{R})$ precisely if $ab|c$ is an element

in $\mathcal{R}$. We call $D(\mathcal{R})$ the *triplet digraph* of $\mathcal{R}$. Furthermore, we say that $\mathcal{R}$ is *caterpillar-compatible* if there exists a caterpillar that displays each triplet in $\mathcal{R}$.

Lemma 9. *A set $\mathcal{R}$ of triplets is caterpillar-compatible if and only if the triplet digraph $D(\mathcal{R})$ is acyclic.*

Proof. Throughout the proof, let X be the label set of $\mathcal{R}$ with $|X| = n$.

First, suppose that there exists a caterpillar T such that each triplet $r \in \mathcal{R}$ is displayed by T. Towards a contradiction, assume that there is a cycle $C = x_0, x_1, ..., x_k, x_0$ in $D(\mathcal{R})$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that C is a simple cycle. First note that, by construction of $D(\mathcal{R})$, each arc of C corresponds to some triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ and no two arcs of C correspond to the same triplet. Now, for each arc (x_i, x_j) in C with $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}$ and $j = (i + 1 \mod k)$, let $r_{i,j}$ be a triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ that corresponds to (x_i, x_j) in $D(\mathcal{R})$. We next show that the triplets $r_{0,1}, r_{1,2}, \ldots, r_{k,0}$ cannot all be displayed by T. To see that this is indeed not possible, observe that, for T to display each triplet $r_{i,j}$ with $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}$ and $j = (i+1 \mod k)$, the path from x_i to the root of T is shorter than the path from x_j to the root of T. This gives a contradiction and, hence, $D(\mathcal{R})$ is acyclic.

Second, suppose that $D(\mathcal{R})$ is acyclic. Since $D(\mathcal{R})$ is a directed acyclic graph, it has a topological ordering, say $(x_n, x_{n-1}, \ldots, x_2, x_1)$, where x_i has no incoming arc in the graph obtained from $D(\mathcal{R})$, by deleting the vertices in $\{x_n, x_{n-1}, \ldots, x_{i+1}\}$. Now, let T be a caterpillar on X such that x_1 and x_2 is the unique cherry of T and, for each $i \in \{3, 4, \ldots n\}$, the parent of x_{i-1} is a child of the parent of x_i. Let $x_i x_j | x_k$ be a triplet of $\mathcal{R}$. By construction of T and because (x_k, x_i) and (x_k, x_j) are arcs in $D(\mathcal{R})$, it follows that $\mathrm{lca}_T(x_i, x_k) = \mathrm{lca}_T(x_j, x_k) <_T \mathrm{lca}_T(x_i, x_j)$. Hence T displays each triplet in $\mathcal{R}$. Combining both cases establishes the lemma. □

We next introduce a new variant of the Dichromatic Number problem. Let D be a digraph and v be a vertex of D. We use $d^+(v)$ to denote the out-degree of v in D and $\Delta^+(D)$ to denote the maximum out-degree of all vertices in D. Now consider the following decision problem.

2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3
Instance. A digraph D with vertex set $V(D)$ and $\Delta^+(D) \leq 3$.
Question. Is D 2-*dicolorable*, i.e. does there exist a vertex coloring of $V(D)$ with at most 2 colors such that the subgraph induced by each color does not contain any directed cycle?

The next theorem establishes NP-completeness of 2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3.

Theorem 11. *The problem* 2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3 *is NP-complete.*

Proof. The problem 2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3 is clearly in NP since, given a coloring of a digraph it can be verified in polynomial time whether or not each color induces a subgraph that does not contain any directed cycle. We complete the proof, by using a reduction from 2-Dichromatic Number to 2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3. Let a digraph D be the input to an instance of 2-Dichromatic Number. We construct a digraph D' from D as follows. Start with $D' = D$ and repeat the steps described in the next paragraph for each vertex v in D with $d^+(v) \geq 3$.

Let v be a vertex of D' that corresponds to a vertex in D with $d = d^+(v) \geq 3$. Replace v with a rooted balanced binary tree T_v on d leaves with v as its root (for an example, see Figure A (left and middle)). In other words, when we replace v by T_v, we still consider v to correspond to the vertex v in D. Furthermore, the leaves of T_v, which may or may not be leaves of the resulting



Figure 5: Left: A digraph D. Middle and right: A gadget for a vertex v of D whose out-degree is at least 3. For details, see the proof of Theorem 11.

graph, are labeled by the d children of v in D. Note that there are, excluding the root which is labeled with v, exactly $d-2$ internal vertices which are labeled with $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{d-2}$. It is now easy to verify that $d^+(v) = 2 \leq 3$ in D'. Next, we add a gadget to D' whose purpose is, as we will see shortly, to force v in D' to have the same color as all its descendants that are contained in $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{d-2}\}$ in any 2-dicoloring of D'. More precisely, we construct a rooted digraph D_v on $d-1$ leaves bijectively labeled with $\{w, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{k-2}\}$ that satisfies the following properties: **(i)** (u, u') is an arc in D_v if and only if (u', u) is an arc in D_v; **(ii)** each leaf of D_v has the same distance from the root; and **(iii)** $\Delta^+(D_v) \leq 3$. Now connect D_v with D' by adding the following $2(d-1)$ arcs in

$$\{(w, v), (v, w), (w_1, v_1), (v_1, w_1), (w_2, v_2), (w_2, v_2), \ldots, (w_{d-2}, v_{d-2}), (v_{d-2}, w_{d-2})\}.$$

It is now easily checked that the digraph D' that ultimately results from the construction described in the last paragraph has $\Delta^+(D') \leq 3$. Furthermore, the construction can be carried out in polynomial time since the size of D' is polynomial in the size of D. Lastly, note that each arc (v, u) in D either corresponds to a single arc (v, u) in D' if $d^+(v) < 3$ in D or, corresponds to a path of vertices such that each vertex on that path except for the last is an element in $\{v, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{d-2}\}$ if $d^+(v) \geq 3$ in D.

The remainder of the proof essentially consists of establishing the following claim.

Claim. D is 2-dicolorable if and only if D' is 2-dicolorable.

Throughout the proof of the claim, let $V(D)$ (resp. $V(D')$) be the vertex set of D (resp. D').

First, suppose that D is 2-dicolorable. Let c be a 2-dicoloring of D. We obtain a coloring of D' in the following way. Assign each vertex v of D' that corresponds to a vertex of D to $c(v)$. Now, for a vertex v of D with $d^+(v) \geq 3$, consider the rooted digraph D_v as defined in the construction of D'. Since D_v satisfies property **(i)**, the only way to color D_v with two colors ζ_1 and ζ_2 is to assign the root to ζ_1 and each other vertex to ζ_1 if it has an even distance to the root of D_v and to ζ_2 otherwise. Without loss of generality, we may assume that each leaf of D_v is assigned to ζ_1. Now consider the rooted balanced binary tree T_v as defined in the construction of D' and, in particular the set of arcs that join a leaf of D_v to a vertex of T_v (and vice versa).

Since w and v form a 2-cycle in D' and, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots d-2\}$, w_i and v_i form a 2-cycle in D', it follows that each vertex in $\{v, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{d-2}\}$ is assigned to ζ_2. Up to interchanging ζ_1 and ζ_2, it now follows that this is the unique 2-dicoloring of the subgraph of D' induced by the vertices of D_v and T_v. By repeating the described procedure for each vertex in D whose out-degree is at least 3, we obtain a coloring c' of D'. We next show that c' is a 2-dicoloring of D'. To the contrary, assume that there exists a directed cycle C' in D' whose vertices are all assigned to the same color. Clearly, if C' contains only vertices that are also vertices in D we are done. Therefore, C' contains a vertex that is not a vertex in D. Since all vertices of C' are assigned to the same color, no vertex of C' is a vertex of any subgraph D_v. Hence, C' only contains vertices of D and, possibly, for a vertex v in D with $d = d^+(v) \geq 3$, the vertex v itself and some vertices in $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{d-2}\}$. In summary, this implies that C' contains a vertex v with $d^+(v) \geq 3$ in D. Now, if we contract all vertices in $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{d-2}\}$ and repeat the procedure for each vertex of C' that corresponds to a vertex of D with out-degree at least 3, the procedure of vertex contractions in C' results in a directed cycle C that only contains vertices of D and, by construction, implies that c assigns all vertices in C to the same color; a contradiction.

Second, suppose that D' is 2-dicolorable. Since $V(D) \subseteq V(D')$, we can obtain a coloring c of D from a 2-dicoloring c' of D' by assigning each vertex in D to the same color as in D'. Now, towards a contradiction, assume that c is not a 2-dicoloring of D. Then, there exists a color ζ that induces a subgraph of D that contains a directed cycle C. By construction of D', it follows that D' contains a directed cycle C' such that the vertex set of C is a subset of the vertex set of C'. Moreover, each arc (v, u) of C either corresponds to an arc (v, u) in C' if $d^+(v) < 3$ in D or corresponds to a directed path from v to u in C' if $d^+(v) \geq 3$ in D. Furthermore, since all vertices on the directed path from u to v in D', which consists of at least one arc, have the same color as v (as justified in the last paragraph), it now follows that, under c', ζ induces a subgraph of D' that contains a directed cycle; a contradiction.

The theorem now follows by combining both cases. □

In the remainder of this section, we show that 2-Π_1 is NP-complete by using a reduction from 2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3. Formally, we reduce an instance of 2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3 to an instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility. Since 2-Caterpillar Compatibility and 2-Π_1 are essentially equivalent (see Observation 1), the result then follows immediately.

Theorem 12. *The problem* 2-Caterpillar Compatibility *is NP-complete.*

Proof. The problem 2-Caterpillar Compatibility is clearly in NP because, given two caterpillars T and T', it can be checked in polynomial time if each element of a set of rooted triplets is displayed by T or T'. We complete the proof, by using a reduction from 2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3 to 2-Caterpillar Compatibility. Let a digraph D be the input to an instance of 2-Dichromatic Number Out-Degree 3. Let v be a vertex of D. Depending on $d^+(v)$, which is at most 3, let $\mathcal{R}_v$ be one of the followings.

(i) If v has exactly one child, say a, set $\mathcal{R}_v = \{ad_v|v\}$, where d_v does not label any vertex of D.

(ii) If v has exactly two children, say a and b, set $\mathcal{R}_v = \{ab|v\}$.

(iii) If v has exactly three children, say a, b, and c, set $\mathcal{R}_v = \{ab|v, ac|v, bc|v\}$.

Now, let

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{v \in V(D)} \mathcal{R}_v,$$

where $V(D)$ denotes the vertex set of D, be the input to an instance of 2-Caterpillar Compatibility. Clearly, the reduction can be carried out in polynomial time and $\mathcal{R}$ has size polynomial in the size of $V(D)$. Moreover, we make the following crucial observation that we will freely use throughout the rest of the proof. Note that $D(\mathcal{R})$, the triplet digraph of $\mathcal{R}$, is essentially the same graph as D. The only difference is that $D(\mathcal{R})$ has an extra leaf d_v for each vertex v in $V(D)$ with $d^+(v) = 1$. However, these extra leaves have no impact upon the acyclicity of $D(\mathcal{R})$.

We next establish the following claim.

Claim. *D is 2-dicolorable if and only if there exists two caterpillars T and T' such that each triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by T or T'.*

First, suppose that D is 2-dicolorable. Let ζ_1 or ζ_2 be the two colors that are used in a 2-dicoloring c of D. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ be the two sets of a bipartition of $\mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathcal{R}_1$ contains each triplet of $\mathcal{R}$ whose witness corresponds to a vertex in D that is assigned to color ζ_1 and, similarly, $\mathcal{R}_2$ contains each triplet of $\mathcal{R}$ whose witness corresponds to a vertex in D that is assigned to color ζ_2. Now assume that $\mathcal{R}_1$ is not caterpillar-compatible. It then follows by Lemma 9 that $D(\mathcal{R}_1)$ contains a directed cycle C. Moreover, the tail of each edge in C corresponds to a witness of some triplet in $\mathcal{R}_1$. Hence, all vertices of C are assigned to ζ_1; thereby contradicting that c is a 2-dicoloring of D.

Second, suppose that there exist two caterpillars T and T' such that each triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by either T or T'. Let $\mathcal{R}_1$ be the subset of triplets of $\mathcal{R}$ that are displayed by T, and let $\mathcal{R}_2$ be the subset of triplets of $\mathcal{R}$ that are not displayed by T. Observe that each triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ is encoded by a unique vertex of D and that a vertex v of D is encoded by either a single triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ (if $d^+(v) < 3$) or three triplets in $\mathcal{R}$ (if $d^+(v) = 3$). Now, let v be a vertex of D. If v is encoded by a single triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ that is displayed by T (resp. not displayed by T), then assign v to color ζ_1 (resp. ζ_2). Furthermore, if v is encoded by three triplets in $\mathcal{R}$, then, by the pigeonhole principle, at least two of those triplets are displayed by T (resp. are not displayed by T) in which case we assign v to ζ_1 (resp. ζ_2). It remains to show that the resulting coloring c of D is a 2-dicoloring. Assume the contrary. Then there exist a directed cycle $C = v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k, v_0$ in D whose vertices are all assigned to the same color under c. Without loss of generality, we may assume that this color is ζ_1. Let $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}$, and let $j = i + 1 \mod k$. We next apply an iterative procedure on each vertex in C and construct a set $\mathcal{R}'_1$ of triplets. Initially, set $\mathcal{R}'_1 = \emptyset$. Now, repeat the following for each v_i in C. If $d^+(v_i) = 1$ in D, reset $\mathcal{R}'_1$ to $\mathcal{R}'_1 \cup \{v_j d_{v_i} | v_i\}$. If $d^+(v_i) = 2$ in D, let a be the child of v_i that is not contained in C and reset $\mathcal{R}'_1$ to $\mathcal{R}'_1 \cup \{v_j a | v_i\}$. Lastly, if $d^+(v_i) = 3$ in D, let a and b be the two children of v_i that are not contained in C, let r_1 and r_2 be the two triplets in $\{ab|v_i, av_j|v_i, bv_j|v_i\}$ that are displayed by T and reset $\mathcal{R}'_1$ to $\mathcal{R}'_1 \cup \{r_1, r_2\}$. In all three cases, it follows by construction of c that, as v_i is assigned to ζ_1, each triplet in $\mathcal{R}'_1$ is displayed by T. It is now easily checked that $D(\mathcal{R}'_1)$ contains C. Furthermore, by Lemma 9, we deduce that $\mathcal{R}'_1$ is incompatible and, hence, $\mathcal{R}_1$ is also incompatible; thereby contradicting that each triplet in $\mathcal{R}$ is displayed by T or T'.

Combining both cases establishes the claim and, therefore the theorem. □

Corollary 1. *The problem 2-Π_1 is NP-complete.*

B Auxiliary computational proofs used in the hardness reductions

In several of the hardness proofs we make use of small instances which, up to symmetry, are the unique solution to the set of constraints they induce. The symmetries differ per problem. For Π_5 (betweenness) and Π_9 (non-betweenness) the set of constraints induced by a linear order α is equal to the set of constraints induced by $\bar{\alpha}$, so a linear order is indistinguishable from its reversal. For Π_1 the first two elements of α can be swapped without altering the set of constraints induced by the order. For Π_6 no symmetries need to be eliminated.

In each case we located these uniquely defined instances by a brute-force search, written in Java. The Java code already verifies the uniqueness property itself, but to increase confidence in the computational proof we then use the constraint programming solver MiniZinc (`http://www.minizinc.org`, see also [16]) as a second check. In particular, the Java code outputs the discovered linear orders $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ - or in the case of 3-Π_1, $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ - and the set of constraints induced by the linear orders. We then ask MiniZinc to look for linear orders that satisfy these constraints but which differ from $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ in at least one position. MiniZinc concludes unsatisfiability. If we remove the "differs in at least one place" constraint, and ask MiniZinc to generate all possible solutions, it generates $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ as the only valid solution. The combination of these results verifies uniqueness.

One of the results in the paper relies on the existence of linear orders $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ such that these are unique instances not just for 3-Π_1 but also for Π_1 on the space of 3 phylogenetic trees. The proof of uniqueness for 3-Π_1 is described above. For the variant on the space of 3 phylogenetic trees, we tackle the proof slightly differently. At a high level, we ask for 3 phylogenetic trees that satisfy all the induced constraints such that at least one of the trees is not a caterpillar. The goal, again, is to generate an unsatifiability. To encode the "at least one of the trees is not a caterpillar", we demand that one of the trees contains at least two *cherries*. A cherry is an internal vertex u such that u has exactly two children, both leaves. Every phylogenetic tree on at least two taxa has at least one cherry. To search through the space of phylogenetic trees, we observe that the $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ in question each have exactly 6 elements. A rooted binary phylogenetic tree on 6 taxa has exactly 4 internal edges. Each internal edge can be identified by a specific *cluster* i.e. the subset of taxa reachable in a downwards direction from it. The tree is uniquely defined by these 4 clusters. These 4 clusters form a laminar family (which corresponds to the concept of *compatibility*, in the phylogenetics literature). We use this characterisation to search through tree space, noting that a tree contains two or more cherries if and only if two or more of its 4 defining clusters have cardinality 2. MiniZinc, as expected, reports unsatisfiability. When the "at least two cherries" constraint is removed and MiniZinc is asked to generate all solutions, it generates $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ as the only solution (as usual, up to elimination of symmetries).

Full source-code for the computational proofs can be downloaded from `http://skelk.sdf-eu.org/ternary`.

C An Integer Linear Program for computation of $\tau(n)$ and $\tau_c(n)$

We begin with computation of $\tau(n)$. We describe an ILP that, for a fixed integer $k \geq 1$, determines whether $\tau(n) \leq k$. The ILP has $3k\binom{n}{3}$ binary variables $x_{ab|c,t}$ where $t \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $ab|c \in \mathcal{T}_n$. Variable $x_{ab|c,t}$ is 1 if and only if tree k displays $ab|c$. To ensure that every triplet in $\mathcal{T}_n$ is displayed by some tree we add the following covering constraint, where t is assumed to

range over $\{1, \ldots, k\}$,

$$\sum_t x_{ab|c,t} \geq 1, \tag{1}$$

for every $ab|c \in \mathcal{T}_n$. We also need to add constraints to ensure that we correctly model trees. To do this, we observe firstly that for every subset $\{a, b, c\}$ of 3 distinct leaves a rooted binary tree displays exactly one of the triplets $ab|c, ac|b, bc|a$. Hence, for every tree t, and for every subset $\{a, b, c\}$ of 3 distinct leaves, we add the constraint

$$x_{ab|c,t} + x_{ac|b,t} + x_{bc|a,t} = 1. \tag{2}$$

Next we make use of the well-known fact that a compatible set of triplets can be characterised by avoidance of local conflicts. In particular, consider a set of triplets in which, for each subset $\{a, b, c\}$ of 3 distinct leaves, exactly one of the three possible triplets with leaf set $\{a, b, c\}$ is in the set. Then, as proven in [7], this set is compatible (and thus corresponds exactly to the set of triplets displayed by some rooted phylogenetic tree) if and only if, for every subset of four distinct leaves $\{a, b, c, d\}$, the subset of triplets whose leaves are in $\{a, b, c, d\}$ are compatible. This, again referring to [7], is equivalent to constraining, for every subset of four distinct leaves $\{a, b, c, d\}$, that if $ab|c$ and $bc|d$ are in the set, then so are $ab|d$ and $ac|d$. This naturally leads to an ILP with $O(kn^4)$ constraints. Specifically, for every tree t and for every subset $\{a, b, c, d\}$ of 4 distinct leaves, we add the constraints

$$x_{ab|c,t} + x_{bc|d,t} - x_{ab|d,t} \leq 1 \tag{3}$$

$$x_{ab|c,t} + x_{bc|d,t} - x_{ac|d,t} \leq 1. \tag{4}$$

This concludes the ILP for computation of $\tau(n)$. The ILP for $\tau_c(n)$ is similar. The only difference is that we add extra constraints which forbid the trees from having two or more cherries. This can be achieved by adding, for every tree t and for every ordered tuple (a, b, c, d) of 4 distinct leaves, the constraint

$$x_{ab|c,t} + x_{cd|a,t} \leq 1. \tag{5}$$